UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,072	12/11/2001	Hirohiko Yamazaki	KOT-0038	9474

23413 7590 12/26/2007

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER	
AILES, BENJAMIN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2142	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/015,072	YAMAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin A. Ailes	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,17-20 and 45-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,17-20,45-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/10/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05 October 2007 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-13, 17-20 and 45-48 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 17-20 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodale et al. (US 5,125,075), hereinafter referred to as Goodale, in view of Tsuji et al. (US 6,047,315), hereinafter referred to as Tsuji.

6. Regarding claim 1, Goodale teaches a work flow system for circulating a digital document file to a plurality of clients through a network, comprising:

a transmission client for initially issuing a document file for circulation (col. 1, line 67 – col. 2, line 2), comprising:

a) a setup processing unit which sets destination information to specify destination and order of circulation (col. 2, ll. 7-10), and

b) a transmission processing unit which sends a circulation information file, including said destination information, and said document file to the next one of a plurality of circulation clients, which is preset so in said destination information (col. 2, ll. 8-14); and

said plurality of circulation clients for sequentially circulating said document file, transmitted by said transmission client (col. 2, ll. 8-14), each comprising:

a transmission processing unit which sends said circulation information file and said document file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients, which is preset so in said destination information, in response to a verification of said document file (col. 4, ll. 46-49 and col. 2, ll. 23-25, clients "vote" for approval).

Goodale teaches the sending of the circulation file but does not does not explicitly teach "wherein when the next one of plurality of circulation clients is incapable of circulation because the transmission of the circulation information file or the

document file to the next one of the plurality of circulation clients terminates incorrectly, said transmission client or one of said plurality of circulation clients, having sent said document file and said circulation information file to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients being incapable of circulation, conducts at least one of (1) notifying incapability of circulation by said next one of said plurality of circulation clients to other ones of said plurality of circulation clients or said transmission client, (2) sending said document file and said circulation information file to other one of said plurality of circulation clients next to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients, (3) sending said document file and said circulation information file to a proxy client of said next one of said plurality of circulation clients". However, in related art, Tsuji teaches a document transmission system which includes a control information unit which includes with an electronic message information for controlling the status of the electronic mail message (col. 4, ll. 22-29). The control information monitors when a recipient is to satisfy certain conditions including deadlines to perform processing and the control information unit notifies the original sender when conditions are unsatisfied (col. 5, ll. 11-26). Further, Tsuji teaches wherein the control information unit can detect when a receiver will be able to respond to a document file that is sent by a sender based on a schedule. If it is determined that a receiver will not be able to respond, an error message is generated stating this fact (col. 6, ll. 6-17). This teaches wherein when a client is incapable of performing operations including the transmission of a document file terminating correctly, at least the sender is notified of this case by way of an error message. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention would have found it

obvious to incorporate the teachings of Tsuji of incorporating control information related to an electronic message with the document circulation method and system as taught by Goodale. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this combination because Tsuji and Goodale are directed towards the same field of endeavor, electronic messaging in a networked environment, and to advance the control of documents flowing in an office environment wherein it is advantageous to monitor the status of time sensitive documents (Tsuji, col. 1, ll. 8-14, col. 2, ll. 18-22, and 59-62).

7. Regarding claim 4, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein said circulation information file includes report destination information regarding a reporting destination of said transmission completion report (Goodale, col. 12, ll. 25-29, originator client is able to view the status of the document file, the document file being able to report status to the originator, therefore the document file knowing the reporting destination is deemed an inherent characteristic.).

8. Regarding claim 9, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein said circulation information file includes storage location information of a storage destination after the circulation of said document file; and one of said plurality of circulation clients, to which said document file is circulated at last, stores said document file to said storage destination in said storage location information in response to a approval operation of said document file (Goodale, col. 4, ll. 54-63).

9. Regarding claim 10, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein said document file for circulation is created from an original document file stored in a

predetermined storage (col. 5, ll. 20-23); said circulation information file includes original information of a storage destination of said original document and storage location information of a storage destination after the circulation of said document file (Goodale, col. 4, ll. 54-63); and one of said plurality of circulation clients, to which said document file is circulated at last, obtains said original document file in response to a approval operation of said document file in accordance with said original information, and stores said original document to said storage destination of said storage location information (Goodale, col. 4, ll. 54-63).

10. Regarding claim 11, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein said one of plurality of circulation clients, having received said document file and circulation information file, adds history information including a verification result of said document file to said circulation information file and sends said document file and circulation information file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients (Goodale, col. 4, ll. 46-53).

11. Regarding claim 17, Goodale and Tsuji teach a work flow system wherein said transmission client or one of said plurality of circulation clients, having received said document file and said circulation information file, adds correction information, for making a correction on said document file, to said circulation information file and sends said document file and said circulation information file to the next one of said plurality circulation clients (Goodale, col. 11, ll. 44-56).

12. Regarding claim 18, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein one of said plurality of circulation clients, to which said document file is circulated at last,

sends circulation completion report to other ones of said plurality of circulation clients in response to a approval operation of said document file (Goodale, col. 2, ll. 8-14, col. 4, ll. 46-49, and col. 12, ll. 32-39 and 46-53).

13. Regarding claim 19, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein said transmission client or each of said plurality of circulation clients comprises:

an information processing means for processing electronic information (Goodale, col. 4, ll. 11-14); and

a storage means for storing a file which is readable with said information processing means (Goodale, col. 4, ll. 22-26);

wherein said storage means stores said document file or said circulation information file when said document file or said circulation information file is received (Goodale, col. 4, ll. 22-26).

14. Regarding claim 20, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein said transmission client or each of said plurality of circulation clients comprises a display means for displaying a transmission button and sends said document file and said circulation information file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients, which is preset so in said circulation information file, so as to be stored in said storage means of said next one of said plurality of circulation clients in response to an operation of said transmission button (Goodale, col. 11, ll. 44-47).

15. Regarding claim 45, Goodale teaches a computer readable recording medium in which software is recorded, a computer executing the software carries out the steps of:

receiving a document to be circulated among a plurality of destinations in a

predetermined order from one of the destinations and an originator of the circulation (col. 1, lines 67-col. 2, line 10);

determining a next destination of the document (col. 2, ll. 7-10);:

Goodale teaches the sending of the circulation file but does not does not explicitly teach "wherein when the next one of plurality of circulation clients is incapable of circulation because the transmission of the circulation information file or the document file to the next one of the plurality of circulation clients terminates incorrectly, said transmission client or one of said plurality of circulation clients, having sent said document file and said circulation information file to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients being incapable of circulation, conducts at least one of (1) notifying incapability of circulation by said next one of said plurality of circulation clients to other ones of said plurality of circulation clients or said transmission client, (2) sending said document file and said circulation information file to other one of said plurality of circulation clients next to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients, (3) sending said document file and said circulation information file to a proxy client of said next one of said plurality of circulation clients". However, in related art, Tsuji teaches a document transmission system which includes a control information unit which includes with an electronic message information for controlling the status of the electronic mail message (col. 4, ll. 22-29). The control information monitors when a recipient is to satisfy certain conditions including deadlines to perform processing and the control information unit notifies the original sender when conditions are unsatisfied (col. 5, ll. 11-26). Further, Tsuji teaches wherein the control information unit can detect when a receiver will be

able to respond to a document file that is sent by a sender based on a schedule. If it is determined that a receiver will not be able to respond, an error message is generated stating this fact (col. 6, ll. 6-17). This teaches wherein when a client is incapable of performing operations including the transmission of a document file terminating correctly, at least the sender is notified of this case by way of an error message. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the teachings of Tsuji of incorporating control information related to an electronic message with the document circulation method and system as taught by Goodale. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this combination because Tsuji and Goodale are directed towards the same field of endeavor, electronic messaging in a networked environment, and to advance the control of documents flowing in an office environment wherein it is advantageous to monitor the status of time sensitive documents (Tsuji, col. 1, ll. 8-14, col. 2, ll. 18-22, and 59-62).

16. Regarding claim 46, Goodale and Tsuji teach the computer readable medium wherein circulating information on the destinations and the predetermined order is attached to the document, and the next destination is determined in the step (1) in accordance with the attached circulation information (Goodale, col. 2, ll. 8-14).

17. Regarding claim 47, Goodale and Tsuji teach the computer readable medium wherein the circulating information on the destinations and the predetermined order has been set by the originator (Goodale, col. 2, ll. 8-14).

18. Regarding claim 48, Goodale teaches a computer readable recording medium in which software is recorded, a computer executing the software carries out the steps of:

setting up circulation information of a document, the circulation information including an order of the circulation among a plurality of destinations (col. 1, lines 67-col. 2, line 10);

Goodale teaches the sending of the circulation file but does not does not explicitly teach "wherein when the next one of plurality of circulation clients is incapable of circulation because the transmission of the circulation information file or the document file to the next one of the plurality of circulation clients terminates incorrectly, said transmission client or one of said plurality of circulation clients, having sent said document file and said circulation information file to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients being incapable of circulation, conducts at least one of (1) notifying incapability of circulation by said next one of said plurality of circulation clients to other ones of said plurality of circulation clients or said transmission client, (2) sending said document file and said circulation information file to other one of said plurality of circulation clients next to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients, (3) sending said document file and said circulation information file to a proxy client of said next one of said plurality of circulation clients". However, in related art, Tsuji teaches a document transmission system which includes a control information unit which includes with an electronic message information for controlling the status of the electronic mail message (col. 4, ll. 22-29). The control information monitors when a recipient is to satisfy certain conditions including deadlines to perform processing and the control information unit

notifies the original sender when conditions are unsatisfied (col. 5, ll. 11-26). Further, Tsuji teaches wherein the control information unit can detect when a receiver will be able to respond to a document file that is sent by a sender based on a schedule. If it is determined that a receiver will not be able to respond, an error message is generated stating this fact (col. 6, ll. 6-17). This teaches wherein when a client is incapable of performing operations including the transmission of a document file terminating correctly, at least the sender is notified of this case by way of an error message. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the teachings of Tsuji of incorporating control information related to an electronic message with the document circulation method and system as taught by Goodale. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this combination because Tsuji and Goodale are directed towards the same field of endeavor, electronic messaging in a networked environment, and to advance the control of documents flowing in an office environment wherein it is advantageous to monitor the status of time sensitive documents (Tsuji, col. 1, ll. 8-14, col. 2, ll. 18-22, and 59-62).

19. Claims 2, 3 and 5-8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodale and Tsuji in view of Mori et al. (US 6,526,425 B2), hereinafter referred to as Mori.

20. Regarding claim 2, Goodale and Tsuji teach the above limitations and further teaches "one of said plurality of circulation clients, having sent said document file and said circulation information file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients" in

column 2, lines 8-14 of Goodale. Goodale and Tsuji do not clearly teach the step of "sends a transmission completion report, regardless of said document file, to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients". However, in related art, Mori teaches on a document circulation method wherein a transaction log is maintained wherein the primary function is to log the circulation history of the document being circulated between clients. The circulation file can be sent along with the actual document being circulated among clients (see column 5, ll. 59-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the document circulation method provided by Goodale and Tsuji and the document circulation method of logging transaction history of a circulation file taught by Mori. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a combination as taught by Mori wherein a system is provided so that clients in a network system can stay informed easily by way of a transaction log which is easily accessible in the network provided (see Mori, col. 2, ll. 62-65).

21. Regarding claim 3, Goodale teaches "wherein said transmission completion report is sent to a predetermined server in said network" in column 12, lines 46-53). Goodale and Tsuji do not clearly teach "said predetermined server sends circulation state information in response to a request from one of said transmission client and said plurality of circulation clients". However, in related art, Mori teaches on a document circulation method wherein clients can access the circulation history of a document by way of request. A client in the system can procure circulation history by way of an order (a request for information), which can be transmitted through the network and to the

appropriate server (where the circulation history, the transaction log is stored) (column 2, line 66 – col. 3, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the document circulation method provided by Goodale and Tsuji and the document circulation method of procuring transaction history of a circulation file as taught by Mori. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a combination as taught by Mori wherein a system is provided so that clients in a network system can stay informed easily by way of a transaction log which is easily accessible in the network provided (see Mori, col. 2, ll. 62-65).

22. Regarding claim 5, Goodale and Tsuji teach the above limitations and further teaches "one of said plurality of circulation clients, having sent said document file and said circulation information file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients" in column 2, lines 8-14 in Goodale. Goodale and Tsuji do not clearly teach the step of "sends said transmission completion report, regardless of said document file, to said next one of said plurality of circulation clients in accordance with said report destination information. However, in related art, Mori teaches on a document circulation method wherein a transaction log is maintained wherein the primary function is to log the circulation history of the document being circulated between clients. The circulation file can be sent along with the actual document being circulated among clients and to the appropriate designated locations (see column 5, ll. 59-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the document circulation method provided by Goodale and Tsuji and the document

circulation method of logging transaction history of a circulation file taught by Mori. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a combination as taught by Mori wherein a system is provided so that clients in a network system can stay informed easily by way of a transaction log which is easily accessible in the network provided (see Mori, col. 2, ll. 62-65).

23. Regarding claim 6, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein said reporting destination is a server for controlling a circulation of said document file (Goodale, col. 12, ll. 25-30) and said one of circulation clients, having sent said document file and said circulation information file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients, sends said transmission completion report to said server (Goodale, col. 12, ll. 46-53). Goodale and Tsuji do not clearly teach "said server sends circulation state information in response to a request from one of said transmission client and said plurality of circulation clients in accordance with said transmission completion report". However, in related art, Mori teaches on a document circulation method wherein clients can access the circulation history of a document by way of request. A client in the system can procure circulation history by way of an order (a request for information), which can be transmitted through the network and to the appropriate server (where the circulation history, the transaction log is stored) (column 2, line 66 – col. 3, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the document circulation method provided by Goodale and Tsuji and the document circulation method of procuring transaction history of a circulation file as taught by Mori. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

perform such a combination as taught by Mori wherein a system is provided so that clients in a network system can stay informed easily by way of a transaction log which is easily accessible in the network provided (see Mori, col. 2, ll. 62-65).

24. Regarding claim 7, Goodale, Tsuji and Mori teach the work flow system wherein said circulation state information includes a state to which one of said plurality of circulation clients said document file for circulation is circulated, or a state with which one of said plurality of circulation clients said document file is confirmed (Goodale, col. 12, ll. 32-36).

25. Regarding claim 8, Goodale, Tsuji and Mori teach the work flow system wherein said transmission client or one of said plurality of circulation clients, having sent said document file and said circulation information file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients and having received said transmission completion report, deletes or makes it possible to delete said document file and said circulation information file from a memory portion (col. 10, ll. 53-56).

26. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodale and Tsuji in view of Murakami et al. (US 2002/0161746 A1), hereinafter referred to as Murakami.

27. Regarding claim 12, Goodale and Tsuji teach the circulation of a document does not clearly recite "wherein said circulation information file includes time limit information for circulation time limit of said document file; and said one of plurality of circulation clients, having received said document file and circulation information file, requests a approval operation of said document file when said circulation time limit of said time limit

information is expired". However, in related art, Murakami teaches on this aspect. Murakami teaches the flow of information (i.e. circulation of documents from one client to the next in a networked system) wherein a expiration time is set as a parameter, called the set conditions for the advancement of a document within a network. Murakami teaches the ability for clients to "approve" of documents during the circulation cycle (see Murakami, page 4, paragraph [0080]). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to teach the document circulation methods taught by Goodale with the document flow management methods taught by Murakami. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to enhance the management capabilities over the flow management of the document between clients and to decrease the time between a request made by a client and improve system availability (see Murakami, page 1, paragraph [0011-0012]).

28. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodale and Tsuji in view of Phillips et al. (US 7,058,696 B1), hereinafter referred to as Phillips.

29. Regarding claim 13, Goodale and Tsuji teach the work flow system wherein "said transmission client or one of said plurality of circulation clients, sending said document file and said circulation information file to the next one of said plurality of circulation clients" (col. 2, ll. 8-14), however does not clearly teach the step wherein a transmission client or one of said plurality of circulation clients "encrypts said document file before sending said document file". However, in related art, Phillips teaches a client/server networked system wherein a client encrypts a document before transmitting the

document over the network to a remote location, in this example a server (col. 6, ll. 38-41). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the document circulation steps as taught by Goodale and Tsuji with the client/server document encryption/decryption methods taught by Phillips. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize encryption techniques taught by Phillips in order to ensure security so that the client feels confident that no one will be able to view private information once a submission is made to a remote location over the network being utilized (Phillips, col. 6, ll. 33-41).

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments filed 05 October 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

31. Applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that the cited references, Goodale and Tsuji, do not teach or suggest "incapable of circulation because the transmission of the circulation information file or the document file to the next one of the plurality of circulation clients terminates incorrectly." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Tsuji teaches in column 6, lines 6-19 that a control information unit (fig. 6, item 34) detects that a receiver will not be able to respond correctly. This detection can be performed when a document is received from a sender by the receiver. The detection is made based on a receiver's schedule, for example a receiver's schedule for the day. If it is detected that a receiver will not be able to respond and circulate the file as needed, it is therefore determined that the circulation of the document will not be performed correctly and a warning message is generated notifying the sender of this condition. Therefore,

the combination of Goodale and Tsuji teaches within the scope of the circulation of the document not terminating correctly as claimed by the applicant.

32. Applicant argues with respect to independent claims 1, 45 and 48 that the cited references "do not teach or suggest a workflow system structured to take one of the specifically claims actions when a circulation client is incapable of circulation, as claimed in claim 1". Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. The examiner maintains, in view of the art applied, that Goodale in view of Tsuji teach the claimed aspects. The "incapability of circulation" by a client is interpreted as a client being unable to distribute a document of interest for any reason. Tsuji is deemed within the scope of the claimed language wherein Tsuji teaches the at least one requirement as required by the claim wherein Tsuji teaches in column 5, lines 11-26 that a user is incapable of distribution wherein a client may be incapable of distribution due to inaccuracies in the document to be circulated wherein certain requirements are not satisfied. If a document is incomplete and more information is needed, then it would have to be deemed inappropriate for the client to circulate the document and therefore it follows that a client would be incapable of circulating and satisfies at least the first (1) condition. Therefore, claim 1 is not deemed patentable over the prior art of record.

33. Applicant argues further with respect to claim 1 that one of the specifically claimed actions of claim 1 is taken immediately when transmission fails to terminate correctly. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., actions of claim 1 is taken immediately) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Miyazawa (US 2007/0282961 A1) teaches an electronic mail system wherein a judging unit determines whether or not a reply email address is capable of broadcasting the same email.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER